

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-2367**

---

JOHN M. DICKSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ROY CHERRY, Superintendent; T. D. HATCHETT, Captain; L. NICHOLS, Sergeant; KIM BUDD, Correctional Officer; S. PIERSON, Correctional Officer; E. FELDER, Correctional Officer; WILLIAMS, Correctional Officer; SWAIN, Correctional Officer; ALLEN, Correctional Officer; JOHN/JANE DOE(S), Correctional Officers,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, District Judge. (2:10-cv-00224-RBS-DEM)

---

Submitted: May 26, 2011

Decided: May 31, 2011

---

Before KING, SHEDD, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John M. Dickson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Samuel Lawrence Dumville, NORRIS, ST. CLAIR & LOTKIN, Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John M. Dickson, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint and his subsequent motions for extension of time to file a notice of appeal and for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Parties are accorded thirty days after the entry of the district court's final judgment or order to note an appeal, Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A), unless the district court extends the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5), or reopens the appeal period under Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(6). "[T]he timely filing of a notice of appeal in a civil case is a jurisdictional requirement." Bowles v. Russell, 551 U.S. 205, 214 (2007).

The district court's order denying relief on Dickson's § 1983 complaint was entered on November 2, 2010. Dickson filed his notice of appeal on December 6, 2010. Because Dickson failed to file a timely notice of appeal or to obtain an extension or reopening of the appeal period, we dismiss this portion of the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

With respect to the district court's order denying Dickson's motion for extension of time to file a notice of appeal and his motion for reconsideration, Dickson's notices of appeal were timely filed. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons

stated by the district court. Dickson v. Cherry, No. 2:10-cv-00224-RBS-DEM (E.D. Va. filed Feb. 1, 2011 & entered Feb. 2, 2011). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART AND DISMISSED IN PART